Claims 20-23

Claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable by **Higgins** in view of **Hill**. The Examiner thought that **Higgins** discloses all limitations of the invention except for "RF radiating/receiving element [that] is a [s]lot formed from material", and that the average skilled person would be motivated to modify **Higgins** in view of "the slot antennas 12-14 (see fig. 3)" of **Hill,** "...in order to have easily and cheaply attached to an antenna housing".

Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection based on the following. First, **Hill**'s antennas 12-14 are patch antennas and not "slot antennas" (see column 4, line 14). Secondly, **Higgins** already has radiator assembly 18 (comprising disks 230 and 232 separated by an air gap) that is designed for a particular environment (telemetry for underground devices – see column 1, lines 15-28). The Examiner has not explained why the average skilled person would replace such particular antenna designs in **Higgins** with slot antennas (which would have very different RF radiation/reception patterns than those particular antennas have in the **Higgins** context). Even assuming that such an explanation existed, the Examiner has not identified where in **Higgins** the average person would place slot antennas. There is nothing "easy" or "cheap" to modify **Higgins** to have slot antennas for the operating environment and objectives of **Higgins**. Quite the opposite, it would very inventive to modify **Higgins** with slot antennas.

Claims 25-26

Claims 25-26 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable by **Higgins** in view of **Hill**. Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection based on the following.

In respect of claim 25, the Examiner thought that **Hill** discloses cover 230. As claim 25 depends on claim 20, Applicant repeats its position above on claim 20.

In respect of claim 26, the Examiner thought that **Hill** discloses "the dielectric 6 properties that do not adversely affect the performance of the radiating element (See column 4, line 25)." Applicant is unclear what "dielectric 6" refers to. **Higgins** has an air gap dielectric between disks 230 and 232 (the radiating elements) and has some dielectric materials supporting such disks, but does not have, as claim 26 recites, dielectric supporter for metallic infrastructure.

Claims 7-18

Claims 7-18 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable because the Examiner thought that those claims recited methods that were inherent in a product that is the combination of **Higgins** as modified by **Hill**. Applicant is not clear about Examiner's position (due to unconventional expressions) but assuming that the preceding appears to be what the Examiner is explaining, reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following.

In respect of claims 7-13, Applicant relies on its arguments above in respect of claim 6, on which claims 7-13 ultimately depend, about the inappropriateness of citing **Higgins.** In respect of claims 7-13 and 14-18, the Applicant does not understand Examiner's analysis as stated based on the combination of **Higgins** and **Hill,** and accordingly, Applicant repeats its above arguments made for claims 20-23, being the claims against which the Examiner has applied that combination.

Claim 24

Claims 24 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable by **Higgins** in view of **Johnson.** The Examiner thought that **Higgins** discloses all limitations except for the incumbent metallic infrastructure of a conventional resource-measuring meter, and that **Johnson** discloses such incumbent metallic infrastructure, and that it would have been obvious to the averaged skilled person to modify **Higgins** to have the conventional resource –measuring meter of **Johnson,** and that the motivation would be to have a "compact package".

Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection based on the following. First, claim 24 is ultimately dependent on claim 19 and so Applicant's arguments above in respect of claim 19 are repeated here. Secondly, it would be structurally repugnant to modify **Higgins** with **Johnson**'s incumbent metallic infrastructure of a conventional resource-measuring meter. **Higgins** is directed to a particular type of meter for a particular environment (telemetry for underground devices – see column 1, lines 15-28) and so structurally would not accept a **Johnson** conventional resource-measuring meter.

Finally, attached for the Examiner's consideration and processing is another copy of the IDS filed concurrently with the Preliminary Amendment and before the issuance of the pending Office Action (with a copy of the fax receipt form). As indicated in the coversheet thereof, a copy of the three non-patent references were provided separately. As explained in the final paragraph of the Preliminary Amendment, the IDS filed therewith replaces the one filed with the initial application. If another copy of any IDS reference is desired, please contact us.

Respectfully,

N. V. S.

Norm Stevenson, Controller

April 8, 2005